

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10, 13-23 and 25 are pending in the application. Claims 13-20 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

(a) Claims 1, 5, 22, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen (USP 4,914,731). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action, the Examiner states that “While the individual holes with the reflector have circular-shapes, it can be seen that the overall shape of the reflector unit (40) has a rectangular shape.

In other words, the Examiner acknowledges that the reflector unit (40) of Chen consists of a plurality of individual holes (reflectors) having a circular shape.

Applicants agree that Chen discloses, in Fig. 3, a reflector 40 having a plurality of circular holes 41 (circular in plan view perpendicular to a light emitting direction of a light emitting chip 51). Further, as shown in Fig. 5, each hole 41 surrounds a single light emitting chip 51.

Chen, however, does not disclose or suggest “a single reflector, having a substantially rectangular shape in plan perpendicular to a light-emitting direction of the LED light source, . . . the reflector being . . . provided above the reflecting surface so as to surround only a single LED light source,” as required in claim 1.

In Chen, a single hole 41 (corresponds to the “single reflector” of the present invention) that surrounds only a single light emitting chip 51 has a circular shape in plan perpendicular to a

light-emitting direction of the light emitting chip 51, and the single hole 41 does not have a “substantially rectangular shape” as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the claimed invention of the present application is directed to a lighting apparatus, which is “a flash device of a camera.”

In contrast, the Chen reference is directed to a display device, which is totally different from the subject matter of the present invention.

Claims 5 and 22, dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 23 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 6, 10, and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wu (USP 6,481,130). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action, the Examiner states that “ The shape of the reflector essentially outlines element 16, which from a plan view, has a rectangular shape.”

When a lens stripe 10 that focuses the light output 12 of an LED linear array 14 for evenly illuminating a display board sign 16, the lens stripe 10 may arguably have a shape circular in plan view perpendicular to a light emitting by the LED linear array 14.

However, as clearly stated in col. 3, lines 19-21, the LED linear array 14 includes a printed circuit board (or other rigid mounting member) 22 upon which a plurality of light emitting diodes (LEDs) 24 is mounted.

Therefore, even assuming that Wu discloses a single elongated reflector having a rectangular shape, the single elongated reflector surrounds a plurality of LEDs and does not surround “the rear side and side surface side of only a single LED light source,” as recited in claim 6.

Moreover, the claimed invention of the present application is directed to a lighting apparatus, which is “a flash device of a camera.”

In contrast, the Wu reference is directed to a linear array of light emitting diodes, which is totally different from the subject matter of the present invention.

Claims 10 and 25, dependent on claim 6, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 6.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Koay et al. (US 2002/0047130). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2, dependent on claim 1, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 3, 4, 11, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Kitano et al. (US 2003/0216151). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3 and 4, dependent on claim 1, are allowable at last for their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 11 and 12 have been canceled.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(c) Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Kitano. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7, dependent on claim 6, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 6.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(d) Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Sommers (US 2003/0180037). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8 and 9 have been canceled, thus rendering this rejection moot.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(e) Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Wu. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21, dependent on claim 1, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims in the present application are respectfully requested.


The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final in that it raises no new issues. Alternatively, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final in that it places the application in better form for Appeal.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi Reg. No. 40,417 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By:  (Reg. No. 417)
Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant